Interactive comment on "Microbial community responses determine how soil-atmosphere exchange of carbonyl sulfide, carbon monoxide and nitric oxide respond to soil moisture" *by* Thomas Behrendt et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 15 July 2018

Behrendt et al. performed a series of well-designed soil chamber experiments in the laboratory to study the processes related with OCS production and OCS consumption, and point to the importance of various enzymes other than carbonic anhydrase in producing and consuming OCS by different microbial communities. This work includes measurements of the soil-atmosphere exchange of OCS, CO and NO for a total of 9 different samples representing agricultural, natural rain forest and desert soils under different soil moisture or water-filled pore space. Given that the complexity in understanding the mechanism of OCS production and consumption, this study has made

quite useful progress/prediction in the direction of disentangling the challenging scientific question. The paper is well written and well structured. Therefore, I support the publication after the following comments are addressed.

No uncertainty was estimated for the measured fluxes of OCS, CO and NO, and some necessary information is missing to get an idea of the measurement uncertainty, e.g. the precision and short-term repeatability of the measurements by the LGR analyzer. Although the potential bias in the scale of OCS could be eliminated by calculating the difference of cout and cref, the short-term instrument drift, on the time scale of the measurement of each chamber, will however cause a direct bias in the calculated fluxes. The authors could refer to similar studies using the same LGR or similar Aerodyne OCS analyzers. It may not be necessary to add uncertainties to the figures; however, it is crucial to perform such analyses and to state the uncertainties clearly in the main text. This is also related to the limit of detection of a few parts per trillion on line 283. Please provide a quantitative number or range to the detection limit, and provide how the detection limit is estimated.

The interpretation of the results should also take the uncertainties of the measurements into account. For example, it is not clear on line 364 that at ~37% WFPSlab these soils flipped to a state of net OCS consumption, because the magnitude of the fluxes falls within the detection limit.

In Figure 2, "The maximum OCS exchange rate and thiocyanate concentration for A2 (green circle) are considered as an outlier, possibly due to release of thiocyanate from fine roots during the sieving procedure". Can the authors confirm this using possibly available soil samples? Why was the maximum observed OCS exchange rate used, not the average OCS exchange rate when WFPS is larger than 37%?

Technical corrections:

P11/L269: missing "to" after "according"

L367-368: do the values refer to the maximum production rate? If so, weatfield and grassland soils seem to produce higher fluxes than A1.

L469: should be "lower soil moisture" instead of "higher soil moisture"?

C3